UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,275	10/13/2005	Christian von Corswant	1103326-0798 6628	
7470 WHITE & CAS	7590 07/28/200 SE LLP	8	EXAMINER	
PATENT DEPA		,	CARR, DEBORAH D	
NEW YORK, N	COF THE AMERICAS NY 10036		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1621	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Applic	ation No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		3,275	VON CORSWANT ET AL.		
		ner	Art Unit		
	DEBO	RAH D. CARR	1621		
The MAILING DATE of this con Period for Reply	munication appears on	the cover sheet with the	correspondence ad	ldress	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE Extensions of time may be available under the proafter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this If NO period for reply is specified above, the maxin Failure to reply within the set or extended period for Any reply received by the Office later than three mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.70	HE MAILING DATE OF visions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no communication. num statutory period will apply an r reply will, by statute, cause the onths after the mailing date of this	THIS COMMUNICATION of event, however, may a reply be to divid expire SIX (6) MONTHS from application to become ABANDON	N. imely filed in the mailing date of this o ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
Responsive to communication(a) This action is FINAL . Since this application is in conclused in accordance with the part of the part o	2b)∏ This action is ition for allowance exce	s non-final. ept for formal matters, pi		e merits is	
Disposition of Claims					
4)	is/are withdrawn from allowed.	consideration.			
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to 10) The drawing(s) filed on is Applicant may not request that any Replacement drawing sheet(s) incl 11) The oath or declaration is object	/are: a) ☐ accepted or objection to the drawing(suding the correction is req	s) be held in abeyance. So uired if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CF		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Rev 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI Paper No(s)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date		

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see pages 2-4, filed 9 April 2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 19-23 under 35 USC§103(a) have been fully considered and were not persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been maintained.

Claim Rejections ~ 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 19–23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janssen et al.

Applicants argue the starting materials used in the Janssen et al. process are not the same thereby producing different compounds and does not disclose that the hydrolytic enzyme used does not affect any existing ester bond.

The instant process basically reacts a substituted carboxylic acid or ester with a polyoxyalkylene glycol or its lower ester in the presence of a hydrolytic enzyme. The hydrolytic enzyme only catalyzes the ester formation between the carboxylic group of the substituted carboxylic acid or ester and the ending hydroxyl group of the POAG or POAG

lower ester without affecting any preexisting ester or ether bond. The carboxylic acid or ester has been substituted with a hydroxyl group wherein said hydroxyl group has undergone ester or ether derivatization. Therefore, the only reactive sites on the starting compounds are the hydroxyl group of the carboxylic acid and POAG or the alkyloxy group on the carboxylic acid lower ester or POAG lower ester.

Janssen et al. also reacts a carboxylic acid ester with a polyoxyalkylene glycol in the presence of a hydrolytic enzyme. The carboxylic acid used in this process is unsubstituted so the only reactive sites on the starting compounds are the hydroxyl group of the carboxylic acid and POAG.

Both the instant process and the Janssen et al processes utilize the same starting materials (carboxylic acid esters and POAG) having the same reactive sites involved in forming the esterified polyoxyalkylene glycols. As stated in the previous office action, application of an old process to a new and analogous material to obtain a result consistent with teachings of the art would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill.

Once the general reaction has been shown to be old, the burden is on the applicant to present reason or authority for believing that a group of the starting compound would take part in or affect the basic reaction and thus alter the nature of the product or the operability of the process and thus the unobviousness of the method of producing it.

Applicants refer to the hydroxyl group on the instant carboxylic acid that has been esterified or etherized as a means of reinforcing the argument that the same products are not produced. However, these moieties on the carboxylic acid ester are not involved in the reaction mechanism so this argument bears no weight.

While Janssen et al. only used PEG400 as the preferred reactant, it is obvious that PEG as a whole can be use to produce these types of compounds. To choose a PEG of a different weight is considered a design choice based on the type of ester one would be interested in producing and falls into the category of routine experimentation.

As to Janssen et al. not stating the lipase used does not affect the ester and ether bonds already present in the compound, there is not indication that is does affect any ester and ether bonds that may be present in the compound. In analyzing, the compounds produced using the lipase, there is no discussion that the ester bonds created were hydrolyzed or the esterification process was reversed while the lipase was present. There is no concern disclosed by Janssen et al. that the use of this hydrolytic enzyme might affect any bond present thereby its use in the process is questionable.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 1-10, & 13-16 are allowed.

Conclusion

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DEBORAH D. CARR whose telephone number is (571)272-0637. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler can be reached on 571–272–0871. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571–273–8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

Application/Control Number: 10/553,275

Art Unit: 1621

Page 6

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information

for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information

about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on

access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-

217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN

USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

 Ddc

/Deborah D Carr/ Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1621